

and implementing relocation and sharing arrangements and, with respect to spectrum vacated by the Department of Defense, certification under section 1062 of P.L. 106-65 by the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that replacement spectrum provides comparable technical characteristics to restore essential military capability; and

(6) given the need to determine equitable outcomes for the Nation in relation to spectrum use that balance the private sector's demand for spectrum with national security and other critical federal missions, all interested parties should be encouraged to continue the collaborative efforts between industry and government stakeholders that have been launched by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to assess and recommend practical frameworks for the development of relocation, transition, and sharing arrangement and plans for 110 megahertz of federal spectrum in the 1695-1710 MHz and the 1755-1850 MHz bands.

Under the previous order, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. WEBB, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. VITTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue in morning business until 7 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I now lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 2838.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 2838) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2012 through 2015, and for other purposes," do pass with amendments.

AMERICAN FISHERIES ACT VESSELS

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my col-

league from the State of Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and my colleague from the State of Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, regarding a provision in H.R. 2838, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012, that deals with two great fisheries of the Bering Sea. The American Fisheries Act—AFA—regulates one of the single greatest fishery resources in the world: Alaska Pollock. This fishery produces over 2 billion pounds of product in most years and is sustainably harvested, thanks to standards set under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Amendment 80 to the Bering Sea Groundfish Fishery Management Plan regulates fishing for other species of groundfish like Pacific cod, Atka mackerel and yellowfin sole and while smaller than the AFA fishery, it still ranks among the major fisheries of the world.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I agree these are two great fisheries and economic drivers of our thriving seafood industry. I have a question about Section 307 of H.R. 2838, which I understand is intended to clarify longstanding restrictions that have applied with respect to certain vessels under the American Fisheries Act. I know that Senator CANTWELL and the senior Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, have worked with Senator BEGICH and others to develop this language for inclusion in the final version of the Coast Guard bill as received from the other body last week, and I think it is important for us to make clear what it is intended to do. I am told that this provision is designed to maintain and reinforce the separation that exists between these two fisheries, and nothing more. Currently, none of these 20 AFA vessels participate in the Amendment 80 fishery, and under Amendment 97 to the Bering Sea Fishery Management Plan they are expressly prohibited from doing so. Is it true that Section 307 maintains this separation?

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I appreciate Senator MURKOWSKI raising this issue, as I know it is of great importance to both our States, and I am happy to discuss the intent and effect of the provision to which she is referring. Senator MURRAY and I have worked closely with Senator BEGICH, with the Commerce Committee, and with our colleagues in the other body to develop this language for inclusion in the Coast Guard bill. Section 307 of H.R. 2838 does, as Senator MURKOWSKI states, clarify longstanding restrictions that apply to certain vessels under the American Fisheries Act. The intent of this language is to maintain the status quo between two separate and distinct fisheries: one regulated under the American Fisheries Act and the other by Amendment 80 to the Bering Sea Fishery Management Plan. There has always been a careful balance struck between these two sectors, and we need to maintain that balance in order to protect the investments and job opportunities they provide. This

language is in no way intended to upset that balance, but rather to insure that the status quo of separate and mutually exclusive sectors remains in place while affording the Amendment 80 fleet the opportunity to replace their older vessels with new ones and to encourage the economic investments that would follow.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, as chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries and the Coast Guard, I concur with my colleagues that this is an important provision, and I want to reiterate that it is only designed to maintain and reinforce the separation between these two fisheries, and nothing more. As NOAA informed our offices via email this week: "There is currently a regulatory prohibition on AFA vessels from being used as replacement vessels in the Amendment 80 fleet. The concerns addressed in the assistance address what would occur if that regulatory prohibition were to be removed. Subject to judicial interpretation, any change to the status quo would need to be made through the Council's and NOAA Fisheries' rule-making process and is unlikely to occur in the near future."

I thank my colleagues.

SURVIVAL CRAFT

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, as my colleagues know, I was the lead Senate author of the Americans with Disabilities Act the ADA. The ADA stands for a simple proposition—that disability is a natural part of the human experience and that all people with disabilities have a right to make choices and participate fully in all aspects of society. Thanks to the ADA, our country has become a more welcoming place not just for people with a variety of disabilities but for everyone.

In that context, I want to raise an issue in H.R. 2838, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012. Under current law, there is a provision that requires that no survival craft allow a person to be submerged in water. H.R. 2838 requires a study and report on this requirement to be completed within 6 months. While I have no objection to the Coast Guard doing another report on the issue, I want to be sure that this study will appropriately take into account the specific needs of people with a diverse variety of disabilities who may need to utilize these survival craft. For example, my expectation is that the study would not recommend that all individuals be required to hold on to the outside of the survival craft or other items, since an individual with a significant disability may not be able to do so, as a result of their disability. In addition, it is important that not only the means of egress, but also the avenues for evacuation and rescue should be accessible for people with disabilities.

I would also want to be sure that the study will be completed within the 6 month designated period.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the comments of